

To: Burt Shephard/R10/USEPA/US@EPA; Joe Goulet/R10/USEPA/US@EPA[]; oe Goulet/R10/USEPA/US@EPA[]
Cc: "Gendusa, Tony" [GendusaTC@cdmsmith.com]; Penoyar, Susan" [PenoyarSJ@cdmsmith.com]
From: "Keefe, Jennifer"
Sent: Wed 3/28/2012 7:10:05 PM
Subject: FW: Specific Comments for Formal Responses
7-1-11_BERA_Response_to_EPA_Comments_Draft_Final_JK_3.12.12_Buck.xlsx

Hi Burt and Joe,

I received formal comments from Jeremy in the attached document to include in our compilation. As you will see in the attached comments and in the body of his email below, he has a concern that could change conclusions of the BERA with regards to the bird egg approach.

Sincerely,

Jenn

From: Jeremy_Buck@fws.gov [mailto:Jeremy_Buck@fws.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, March 28, 2012 1:37 PM
To: Keefe, Jennifer
Cc: peterson.jennifer@Deq.state.or.us
Subject: RE: Specific Comments for Formal Responses

Hi Jenn-

I attached my comments on the wildlife sections in the far column on the attached worksheet.

My primary issue is with the bald eagle egg approach. The LWG assumes the site specific osprey eggs would be equivalent to eagle eggs, and ignores the higher trophic level of the bald eagles, and that contaminants in the lower Columbia River eagles eggs tend to around 2 times higher than osprey. I have added language regarding this issue into the comments.

The mink evaluation seems to be done correctly, although not much was discussed about the localized river mile evaluation of risk.

I didn't have much time to look more specifically at the shorebird comments, and if I get a chance later I will do so.

Thanks -jeremy